UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Education, General Semantics, and Scientific Humanism - - *Oliver L. Reiser*

Basic Emotional Cultures Required in a Democracy - - - *DuFay R. Rice*

Opportunities and Responsibilities of Youth - - - - - - *Albert J. Lewis*

"Representatives of Two Nations Join in Building a Rural School" - *Clarence Senior*

A Layman's Opinion - *Catherine Appleby*

THE STUDY TABLE

VOLUME CXXV NUMBER 3

Chicago, April 1, 1940

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 35
Jottings—J. H. H. 37

ARTICLES—

Education, General Semantics, and Scientific Humanism—OLIVER L. REISER 38
Basic Emotional Cultures Required in a Democracy—DUFAY R. RICE 40
Opportunities and Responsibilities of Youth—ALBERT J. LEWIS .. 41
"Representatives of Two Nations Join in Building a Rural School" —CLARENCE SENIOR 43
A Layman's Opinion—CATHERINE APPLEBY 45
Belgium's Dire Dilemma—*Nofrontier News Service* 46

THE STUDY TABLE—

Making History with Sonnets—SINCLAIR CRAVEN 47
A Notable Project—CHARLES A. HAWLEY 48
A Peace Program—GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE 48

THE FIELD—

Colors of Destruction—DR. W. S. GERMAN 34
Dictators as Gods—*Nofrontier News Service* 48

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Colors of Destruction

Hitler's Painting of Burning Warsaw

DR. W. S. GERMAN

[Editor's Note: The author is a well-known German author and lecturer whose works have found disfavor with the Nazis. He is an authority on many religious and political questions in the Third Reich. His article is released through the *Nofrontier News Service*.]

Nero was an artist. While the city of Rome was in flames, he stood on a hill, playing on his harp, and singing the beauty of that frightful spectacle.

Adolf Hitler is another artist. While Warsaw was burning, a Messerschmitt plane was flying over the Polish capital and inside it "Professor" Ernst Vollbehr—who had been brought there at Hitler's personal request—was busily painting the horrible scene.

Vollbehr made sketches while his assistants took photographs. Using both, the destruction of Warsaw was then carefully painted in water colors and oil, and the whole batch of the resulting pictures was considered fit for an exhibition — at Christmas! — in the Kunstverein, Munich's most representative gallery for modern art exhibits.

The Christmas issue of the *Völkischer Beobachter*, the principal newspaper of the Nazi party, filled an entire page with reproductions of these latest war pictures, and stressed the fact that without Hitler's personal artistic interest these wonderful achievements would never have been possible.

The painter Ernst Vollbehr had been active during the World War of 1914-18. He painted on all battle-fronts and produced an enormous number of oils and water colors. It is quite to the credit of the general public in Germany that only a small quantity of the stuff could ever actually be sold. But Hitler liked such patriotic art and when he came to power in 1933 he bought *all* the war pictures of Herr Vollbehr and handed them over to the *Zeughaus* (military museum) in Berlin, where they have since then been accessible to the public.

Hitler took Herr Vollbehr into his special services and presented him with the title of "Professor." Vollbehr was ordered to paint the Nazi Congress Buildings in Nuremberg, the famous motor roads, and the Brown House at Munich. Early in 1938, he was sent by Hitler to the western frontier to produce oil pictures of the Siegfried Line. He was still busy at that task when the Polish campaign started.

In all of Hitler's preparations for his attack on Poland the Führer had not lost his "artistic" ambitions or forgotten his battle-painter Vollbehr. Vollbehr was brought to the Polish front and told to go everywhere Hitler considered necessary, in order to paint from the air while bombs were still falling. Vollbehr painted the land and sea battles around the Hela peninsula, the first fighting in the Corri-

(Continued on page 48)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXV MONDAY, APRIL 1, 1940 No. 3

THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE

Science unapplied, or applied only to the gratification of personal vanity or personal taste, is cold and soulless; use it for man's best interests and it becomes elevated to the dignity of a religion. The application of knowledge to man's highest interests on earth is the religion of science—an eminently practical religion, showing itself by its works; a religion which, humble though it be, and fully conscious of its imperfections, still struggles with its best efforts to do good; a religion which asserts its fallibility, and by that very assertion holds out an assuring promise of continued improvement.

—Samuel Logan

A PILGRIM OF PEACE

How familiar was the statement, published repeatedly in the dispatches from Europe about Mr. Sumner Welles' round of the European capitals, that any discussion of peace terms by any nation would be regarded as "a sign of weakness." That's what kept the last war going for more than four years, until Germany collapsed and the Allies were all but exhausted. Again and again, especially in 1917, the war could have been stopped, had not all the belligerents been afraid of showing "weakness" to the enemy. And now, apparently, for the same reason, the same dance of death is to go on to the same bitter and disastrous end. Yet we cannot believe that, behind the secrecy of Mr. Welles' admirably managed tour, there was not some fruitful discussion of the ways to peace. Perhaps the very endeavor to appear intransigent, especially in Berlin, was only a thick smoke-screen deliberately released to hide the more effectually what was really going on. But of all this, of course, we know nothing. Mr. Welles has come home enwrapped in as dense a cloud of mystery as he went away. But he must have gained, if not proffers of peace, then impartations of information which must be of invaluable assistance to Washington. We are convinced that the President is sincere in his peace endeavors, and must believe that he is working not without encouragement from abroad. Now comes Mr. Welles with first-hand news, personal impressions, perhaps unofficial but none the less direct disclosures of what may be possible along lines of reconciliation. What seems at the moment to be a good deal of a failure may in the end prove to be an amazing success. At any rate, we are going to hope on and pray on until the last flicker of peace in our day has died away. It will be time enough to surrender when all peace moves have finally come to an end, and the full horrors of modern war have been let loose upon the continent. Meanwhile, Mr. Welles is to be congratulated upon conducting his difficult and delicate mission with admirable discretion. In this Assistant Secretary of State America evidently has a diplomat of first-class rank.

THE MUNITIONS SCANDAL

Hardly had we published our editorial on the continuing trade going on between the belligerent powers (See *Unity,* issue of February 19th, page 184), when along came the March issue of *Harper's Magazine* with an article which not only confirmed our editorial but amplified it almost beyond belief. This article, entitled "Selling to the Enemy," is written by Frank C. Hanighen, long an expert in this field. "While the French and German armies have been fighting," writes Mr. Hanighen, "French and German industrialists have been doing business with each other. These industrialists have been selling each other the materials out of which shells and cannon are made." The article, something over five pages long, is an amplification in detail of this statement. For example, coke from Germany is pouring daily into France through Luxembourg, to keep the French fires burning. In the opposite direction, from France into Germany, goes iron ore from the French iron mines in Lorraine. The loss of Lorraine in the last war, in other words, did not mean anything to Germany; she gets the iron ore just the same! French industrialists in Luxembourg, a neutral country, are shipping regularly into Germany iron ore from their mines and steel from their mills. Without interruption since the war began, "tools, machinery, and implements have been exchanged between Germany and France *via* Belgium." And how explain the complete failure on both sides to bomb the munitions factories of the enemy—is this the result of an "agreement, tacit or otherwise"? All this, of course, is nothing new. The warring countries in the last war, as we now well know, were supplying one another with arms and war materials throughout the duration of the conflict. In the same way all the preparations for this present war were carried on by Frenchmen in behalf of Germany as by Germans in behalf of France. Within a few days, or even hours, of the outbreak of war in

September last, England was sending scrap-iron to the Reich. Profits, in other words, know no frontiers. "Business as usual" is the slogan for war as well as peace. Mr. Hanighen speculates as to whether "the peoples who are shedding their blood because such a war is prolonged are willing . . . to countenance this trade." Perhaps they are. But then again perhaps they are not. Then what?

PALESTINE AGAIN!

How quickly the scene changes in this world of ours is illustrated by what has happened in Palestine since the writing and publishing of the editorial in our last issue (March 18th, page 19). That editorial was based on direct and wholly authentic information—the Arabs and Jews in the Holy Land had ended their differences, and were friends where they once were enemies! But before this editorial could reach our readers, Britain once more stepped into the picture, and in her own interest, and in betrayal of every pledged interest of Zion, mudded everything up again. Palestine is now cast into new discord and confusion by the order of Colonial Secretary MacDonald, that Jews shall no longer be allowed to purchase land of Arabs. What this order amounts to is vividly described by Mrs. John Gunther, in a letter to the New York *Times*:

> Today in Palestine—after leading the Jews on for years to believe in their homeland, and incidentally to invest half a billion dollars as well as half a million lives in its development—the British tear up the League of Nations mandate, revive that old bogy about the "uprising of the Arab world," herd the Jews into another, only smaller, Lublin reservation, designate the land as restricted and prohibited by decree from purchase by Jews, guard the Palestine coast against their entry, and command Balkan governments to close their frontiers to Jewish fugitives from Nazi terror.

It's the old game of empire—always in this case in favor of the Arabs and against the Jews. It's the unvarying policy, in Palestine as in India, of "divide and rule." For twenty years the British have been deliberately alienating Arabs and Jews, as in India they have deliberately set at loggerheads Hindus and Moslems, and then claiming that British troops must be on hand to preserve order and keep the peace. As a matter of fact, whenever left alone in Palestine, the Arabs and the Jews have gotten along beautifully. Before the British arrived, as in these recent months since the opening of the war, they have been friends and fellow-laborers. They have a common interest in one another, and together against their alien imperial rulers. What wonder that Jews cry out in dismay, and Americans distrust Britain anew. Mrs. Gunther sums it all up:

> As long as the British speak in terms of democracy . . . , and continue to act in terms of conquest and dictatorship and imperial domination, their American friends must become more gravely and increasingly concerned.

BIBLIOLATRES!

The Bible is still sacred, apparently. In spite of recent anthologies in which the Bible has been classified with other scriptures as a part only of the classic religious literature of the past, there still occurs a rumpus when any drastic attempt is made to apply the logic of the modern scientific attitude to the Old and New Testaments. Thus, in New York the other day Mr. William Floyd, Editor of the *Arbitrator,* took the Bible into court. An irresponsible evangelist by the name of Rimmer had challenged anybody to find a single scientific error in the Bible, and offered a thousand dollars reward for the feat. Mr. Floyd promptly sent a list of fifty-one such errors, but failed to receive the thousand dollars. Whereupon he entered suit. But did he get anywhere? He did not! Amid resounding publicity that carried from one end of the country to the other, the judge threw the case out on a technicality, and asked unofficially and informally how he could be expected to admit as erroneous the sacred stories on which he had been reared from childhood. Again, the Editor of this paper recently published in the *Christian Century* an article in which he accused the Christians of "stealing" the Old Testament from the Jews to whom it properly belonged. He argued that the Old Testament was Jewish, not Christian, scriptures; and that the Christians had no right to add this Old Testament to their Bible (the New Testament), to claim it and use it as their own inspired literature, and even to introduce into it as margin comments and chapter headings, all kinds of references to Christ and to his church. Well, did this cause a furore? It certainly did—some readers of the *Century* approving, others outraged, and all apparently excited. It all goes to show that, in spite of generations of the higher criticism, the Bible, like the Ark, is still too sacred to be touched. The situation is peculiar! All adequately educated persons know that the Bible is a noble but none the less utterly human literature, as much an historical product of its own time as any other literature, of course full of errors, quaint and in some cases terribly superstitious, as well as some of the most exalted utterances of the mind of man. Along with this informed opinion stands the great inert mass of ignorant and superstitious folk who still regard the Bible as the infallible "word of God." To anybody who knows anything, the Bible issue is settled. But most people have still to hear of it! So what's the use?

AMERICAN LITERATURE IN MOURNING

The week of March 3rd last was hung in black for the mourning in this country of Hamlin Garland and Edwin Markham. Not often in the space of a few days does literature suffer such a loss. Both men, of course, were old—Garland in his 80th year, and Markham in his 88th! Garland was working at the time of his passing on a book descriptive of his life in southern California, where he died; Markham had one last desire to write a poem which would do for the soldier what "The Man With the Hoe" had done for the toiler. But had the book and the poem been published, they would have added nothing to the authors' fame, for the

work of both of these distinguished writers was long since done. The two men were westerners—Markham a son of the Far, and Garland of the Middle, West—and saw, therefore, each in his own place, the swift expansion of the nation to its Pacific frontier. Markham was the bard of this new nation. He sang its songs and chanted its litanies. His greatest poem was his immortal tribute to Lincoln—greatest because most deeply felt and therefore most nobly expressed. Brotherhood was his constant theme—brotherhood as lit by liberty and sustained by justice. He wrote in many poetic forms, but was at his best in grandiose blank verse, where his sonorous and sublime eloquence had free play. He succeeded Whitman as the "good gray poet" of the land, and by popular acclaim was America's laureate. Hamlin Garland drew his material from the flood-like sweep of continental migration which he saw and felt as at once a spectator and participant of the drama. The conquest of the Indian ranges, the planting of the new soil, the building of the railroads, the organization of territories and states—these were the substance of his books, which are not merely superb specimens of literature but sagas as well of a period and place. Like Markham, he held his own in this later age when he was a memory rather than a creative force. The younger critics knew not these men—they talked and wrote of Joseph Auslander, and Archibald MacLeish, and T. S. Eliot, and Ernest Hemingway, and Erskine Caldwell, and James Farrell. But there the giants stood—like two old oaks amid the scrubblings of some new forest growths. And now that they are gone—like Markham's Lincoln, they leave—

"A lonesome place against the sky."

PRAISE BE TO GOD—

That we can turn off the radio, by a mere twist of the hand, when the salve-y boys begin their advertising patter about lotions, breakfast foods, ginger ales, digestive tablets, and what have you. . . . That we don't have to wear, as well as look at, the hats that make even a beautiful woman ugly these days. . . . That we can get along without smoking cigarettes, and thus avoid paying the cigarette tax. . . . That we are under no necessity of trying to square the spiritual circle by reconciling war with Christianity. . . . That our trousers are not lengthened, and then shortened, after the fashion of women's skirts. . . . That James Joyce and Gertrude Stein and James Branch Cabell are not required reading. . . . That an occasional movie, such as "Grapes of Wrath," is as good as its producers say it is. . . . That Walt Disney doesn't know who Picasso is, and therefore is under no temptation to imitate him. . . . That this land is not yet a world of black-outs, ration cards, and night alarms. . . . That we have finished with our income-tax statement—at least until the government calls us to account. . . . That Prohibition is again well started on its way to wiping out a liquor traffic worse than this country has ever hitherto known. . . . That not all the people of America have yet been killed or injured by automobiles. . . . That we don't have to stick our big toe out through a hole in our shoe in order to be in style. . . . That we are entirely free to skip all the stuff in the newspapers about the third term, written as it is by men who know no more about the riddle than we do. . . . That flying in this country has just reached the end of a year in which not a single passenger life has been lost on the commercial airway lines. . . . That it is not our business to reckon and report the accumulating deficits in the national treasury. . . . That we are not a census-taker in a small town, interviewing our next-door neighbor. . . . That UNITY still has loyal subscribers, good friends, interested readers, who think their own thoughts, ask us to do the same, and rejoice in nothing quite so much as a frank statement of free opinion.

Jottings

The Rev. L. C. Miller, of Manitou Springs, Colorado, has the right idea. He suggests that, as motorists speed along the highway, they sing hymns, as follows:

> At 25 miles per hour, "I'm But a Stranger Here, Heaven Is My Home"; at 45 miles, "Nearer, My God, to Thee"; at 55 miles, "I'm Nearing the Port and Will Soon Be at Home"; at 65 miles, "When the Roll Is Called up Yonder I'll Be There"; at 75 miles, "Lord, I'm Coming Home."

In Miami, Florida, a Negro out on the street after 7 P. M. is subject to arrest. Just like the Jews in Berlin! We wonder if the southern whites got the idea of this curfew law from the German Nazis.

With Ireland ablaze with revolution, India on the threshold of a new civil disobedience campaign, and Palestine in rebellion against the latest restrictions upon the Jews, it would seem as though old Britain were having as many troubles as the Old Lady that Lived in a Shoe. But will the Empire be able to dispose of her trouble-makers as effectually as the Old Lady did of hers?

We always find ourselves wondering! The kings in grand opera have deep bass voices; but the hero-princes are tenors. What happens when the princes inherit their fathers' thrones? Do their voices, like those of adolescent boys, undergo a change?

It is estimated that Finland lost 15,000 dead in the late war, and Russia 200,000. The peace is hailed as a great victory for Russia. But what about the Russians? Did they win or lose? J. H. H.

Education, General Semantics, and Scientific Humanism

OLIVER L. REISER*

Among the many social problems being discussed today is the question: What is wrong with American education? Various investigators have different views on this matter, but the answer, it seems to me, is simple and clear. Fundamentally the trouble with our educational theory and practice is that it is in the hands of racketeers. This discovery is not altogether original with the present author; the indictment has been made before. But while others have only timidly suggested this educational iconoclasm, and have never really substantiated their charge, we here propose to demonstrate that this is the case.

Of course professional educators will not publicly admit the truth of the foregoing claim. Perhaps in the secret recesses of their hearts they do not even believe it. They will admit that education is big business—any organization which involves over thirty million persons is in the nature of a giant corporation. But that the leaders of this institution, the American school, are defrauding the public in a big way is a serious and untrue charge, they will affirm. Now I think we must agree that those who are running the game of education are not *knowingly* trying to defeat the proper aims of education. That much is obvious. Rather, the captains of the educational industry are in the position of persons who *unwittingly* commit anti-social acts. But in neither case can ignorance be accepted as an excuse. Quite the contrary.

Educators, unlike the ordinary racketeers who are breaking the law *and know it,* are not consciously running a racket; but their delinquency here is doubly indefensible, since educators are supposed to be self-critical and know what they are doing. They should set unusually high standards and stick to them, precisely because a school should embody the ideals and way of life that our own social system could be at its best. Education is the last refuge of social idealism, and when educators take over the standards and tactics of racketeering, they are doing more to undermine the foundations of democratic government than all the gangsters, corrupt politicians, and economic royalists.

And why is education a racket? Because it is doing the one thing which makes it impossible for us to find our way out of the wilderness into the promised land of social utopia. To prove this I must first show what the fundamental trouble is that afflicts our bewildered world. Let us therefore return to our original question.

What is wrong with American education? The trouble with education is the same as the trouble with modern civilization. We are a confused people, living in a chaotic world. President Robert M. Hutchins, of the University of Chicago, is correct in his diagnosis: education is chaotic because society is confused, and society is confused because education has no clearly-thought-out philosophy. Parenthetically it may be noted that there is little confusion in Fascist states; but internal order is purchased at the price of world security.

The remedy for all this immediately suggests itself. Our social system will find its way out of confusion and bewilderment when education gives the public a coherent theory and way of life. True, this puts a tremendous burden upon our schools and the facilities of education; but even if we go all the way with the thesis of H. G. Wells, that it is a race between education and disaster, we are not committed to fatalism and social pessimism. The hopeful signs of a new era may be visible in the distance, but before indicating what we believe are the grounds for hope and courage we must complete our diagnosis of the reasons underlying our present educational chaos.

The basis on which we rest our claim that education is a racket is an integral part of our view of the place of philosophy in the world of life and action. Recently a well-known expounder of behavioristic psychology, with an uncanny ignorance of the history of human thought, stumbled across what he thought was an original generalization and announced that in fifty years philosophy would be dead. Now it would doubtless be rash to attempt to prove that philosophy will live forever. But the more modest thesis that so long as society and the social sciences are incomplete and growing, so that there still remain frontiers of intellectual and cultural advance, philosophy will continue to have a proper place in the life of society is one which almost any philosopher would be willing to defend. But I shall adopt an even stronger position and suppose that for the immediate future at least philosophy must become even more vital and pervasive. This idea rests upon a particular conception of the function of philosophy which I shall now sketch very briefly. Explicitly stated, the fundamental assumption of the present theory is this: *one important function of philosophy is to formulate general hypotheses, tentative solutions and plans of action, which are then to be tested empirically in the workaday world of facts.*

An examination of the meaning of this assumption will show that it commits us to the view that what passes as science today is nothing other than a standardized philosophy which generations ago became accepted by a group of "experts" in some given field, thus to be passed on as the common property of that science. Accordingly, the content of any "science" is the tested and verified residuum of that form of specialized folkways which is called "scientific method." Science, on this theory, may be inseparably linked with the "laboratory," provided in the social sciences we are permitted to think of society itself as a laboratory.

I am at pains to make clear the general presuppositions of this view because the validity of my next assumption rests upon the soundness of this more general basis. My next assumption, then, is this: *education in general, or any particular educational system, is simply a socially accepted (conventionalized) philosophy in action.* An educational system is a technique for passing on to subsequent generations those cultural ideals and practices which any given social group deems worthy and desirable. This is true whether the education (or philosophy in action) we are considering is that of a primitive group or a complex modern society. In primitive group life we find that the educative process works through customs and traditions which are transmitted, almost unconsciously, from gen-

*Professor of Philosophy, University of Pittsburgh.

eration to generation through the instruments of social heredity. But modern societies also have their generally accepted body of ideals and practices. These are the "socially conditioned premises" of our thinking—the axioms of the culture which are taken for granted. And in an age of transition, a period of the disintegration of the old if not the synthesis of a new system, we are forced to become more critical about our assumptions. This, however, is only another way of saying that we are growing more philosophical in our thinking about education. If education is simply a standardized philosophy in action, the problem of building up a new educational system to meet the demands of a new world is simply the problem of thinking out a new philosophy. We see, therefore, that—contrary to a behavioristic view—the need for philosophizing grows more insistent with the increasing complexity of the modern world.

It will be obvious, now, that we not only agree in a general way with the thesis of President Hutchins, but we also go a considerable distance with him in the matter of a proper remedy. He is correct in his argument that only a well-thought-out philosophy can give us an integrated educational theory and practice. John Dewey's deep suspicion that President Hutchins' search for a "hierarchy of truths" to give guidance to a troubled world will lead us to an intellectual Fascism, which the schools and universities will then foster and perpetuate, probably rests in a considerable measure on the close tie-up of President Hutchins' views and Mortimer Adler's medievalism. But if President Hutchins freed his program from Adler's scholastic Aristotelianism—and the connection is not a necessary one—many of us could go along with him in his proposed reforms.

The argument of President Hutchins that we need more of the study of logic in our schools is essentially sound, except that here again we must get away from the sterile Aristotelianism (in logic) of an outmoded scholasticism. Let us say that instead of traditional logic we should emphasize the study of *general semantics*. This science, a kind of psycho-logic of understanding and orientation, has been brought to the public eye through the popular volume by Stuart P. Chase, *The Tyranny of Words*, which is a more readable version of Alfred Korzybski's work, *Science and Sanity*. But as many are aware, the study of semantics is also an integral part of the "unity of science" movement which is finding its articulate expression in the *International Encyclopedia of Unified Science*. This renewed interest in logic, coupled with clear thinking about the field of values (e.g., the "scientific humanism" of Lancelot Hogben, Thomas Mann, John Dewey, *et al.*), is of greatest practical value to our world, and education will be profoundly affected by results in this field. And this brings us back to our original claims about the educational racket.

We have said that present-day culture needs badly a new philosophy for its own type of civilization. If the modern world is not to go down to destruction from lack of unifying principles, the teacher must be able to help humanity find and disseminate that new philosophy for this unprecedented age. But the educational setup is such that it is almost impossible for the teacher to find, or help the student find, this new philosophy. Schools of education are defeating their own best aims by creating the paradox of the anti-intellectual university, as President Hutchins terms it. Schools of education struggle to hold on to their own students and confine them to the same courses which are accessible to public school pupils. There is here a vicious circle involving, on the one hand, the college and normal school courses yielding credits toward certification and, on the other hand, the subjects taught in the public schools. This is an unholy alliance. There is no logic or ethics in high schools because vested interests (subjects already entrenched in the curriculum) keep them out, and teachers do not take them in college because they cannot use them in teaching, and accordingly these courses are frequently not even accepted for teacher certification. If such courses in philosophy are verbally encouraged, they are in fact kept out of the university curriculum of the teachers-to-be by other subjects which are required. Thus educational administrators, the robber-barons of pedagogy, maintain the intellectual *status quo* of the teacher-slaves. And thus it happens that teachers know nothing concerning human intellectual history—the *Republic* of Plato, the *Politics* of Aristotle, and so on—and hardly more concerning contemporary issues in social science—the connection of *laissez-faire* economics with utilitarianism, the dialectical materialism of Karl Marx, the philosophical origins of Fascism, and so on.

Let it be clearly understood that we are not arguing that philosophy departments should hand out an official doctrine for teachers to adopt and promulgate. The purpose of a philosophy department is *not* to give a student a complete and final philosophy, but to give him the *tools* and the *method*, so that teachers-to-be can work out this new philosophy of education. Part of this equipment is a knowledge of what the great "heroes of social progress" have thought and visioned. An additional part of this equipment, as we have insisted, is a knowledge of the science of reasoning and human adjustment (general semantics). Contrary to the popular conception that logic is a dull and technical subject, divorced from practical realities, we believe that logic is the architecture of mental activity and therefore can be and should be deeply interesting and significant.

This view has some affinities with the "progressive education" movement. The progressive educationists are correct in their criticism of our present curricula, the current grading system, and our harmful motivations in learning. But if students are to be prepared to live in our modern complex world they will have to be conducted across the enormous gap separating the adult life (with its deferred values) from the world of simple and immediate values of the child, who in his outlook and interests is about where primitive man was before the great adventure of civilization. Students must be taught to become interested in our contemporary social problems. A properly motivated education in which thinking and problem-solving activity ("projects") are closely knit together should be developed to function through an "integrated" and a vitalized curriculum. All this calls for a philosophy. Our present group of teachers know little philosophy and have cultivated their interests and abilities in this direction not at all. As we have suggested, this is not their own fault. It is a result of the educational racketeering which has crept into the American system of education. Until such racketeering is stopped, I see little hope for American education.

Basic Emotional Cultures Required in a Democracy

DuFAY R. RICE

A Common Purpose Provides a Unifying Emotion in a Democracy. This common purpose is clearly set forth in the preamble to the Constitution:

(a) To "form a more perfect union."
(b) To "establish justice."
(c) To "insure domestic tranquility."
(d) To "provide for the common defense."
(e) To "promote the general welfare."
(f) To "secure the blessings of liberty."

A certain amount of unity is necessary for the success of any government. If divisive forces become more numerous and stronger than the unifying forces, the government will surely break up. Or one of the stronger forces, through suppressing the many clashing minorities, will predominate by physical force.

A democracy cannot be a democracy if it uses force to bring about unity. The fact is that fear and force have never held people in subjection permanently. Reverence, awe, and loyalty to a king or dictator may unite people in kingdoms or totalitarian states, but a democracy must depend upon other emotions to bring about a unity of feeling and purpose. It is true that certain elements in a democracy must be restrained or even punished in order that the common purpose may be realized. The restraint set up by a majority of the people is in striking contrast to the restraints imposed by one man.

The unity which comes from a common purpose is no doubt based upon the higher emotions of man. In these emotions there is no place for selfishness and greed. On the contrary, the emotions which give rise to the wholehearted acceptance of the brotherhood of man, the right of every man to have a share in determining his own destiny, bring about a oneness of spirit that is stronger than any other bond of unity, whether it be that furnished by a duce, fuehrer, dictator, or a king.

In any group, large or small, the *emotional* acceptance of a common purpose furnishes the unifying force that gives coherence and strength to the group. A common purpose furnished the emotional drive necessary to bring the Revolutionary War to a successful conclusion. Doubts as to the common purpose brought on the divisive acts which ended in the Civil War. The return, after this war, to a general acceptance of a common purpose by all the States is one of the great triumphs of democracy.

Today, the threat to unity comes from a growing belief that justice does not always prevail, particularly social and economic justice, that the common welfare is often subordinated to the welfare of a powerful economic or political group; that opportunities for the pursuit of happiness have been greatly restricted, and that freedom and liberty are without meaning when an honest citizen does not have opportunity to work, or cannot work in peace under the protection of his government.

The tendency, therefore, is to condemn democratic government. This is as ridiculous as condemning a good car that crashes into a telephone pole because the driver does not know how to drive. History teaches nothing more clearly and definitely than that a democracy is superior to all other forms of government. All autocratic governments have ended in tyranny. But even tyranny does not last. It contains within itself the seeds of its own destruction. After a period of tyranny, the unifying effect of a common purpose begins to move people to action, with the result that tyranny is overthrown and the sovereignty of man is enthroned in the hearts of people. But the common purpose once attained does not insure its own protection and continuance. It can be kept alive only by the powers of the emotional cultures of a democracy. Culture, in this sense, is an attitude or an ideal which has been definitely cultivated. It is not an original tendency, or a "natural born" behavior pattern of people. On the contrary, it is a body of acquired *value* concepts having an emotional core.

Respect for Law Is a Prime Essential in Any Form of Government. Under an autocratic king or a dictator, respect for law is obtained through the building up of loyalty to the king or dictator. Since this loyalty is a personal loyalty, it is easier to build than is loyalty to a constitution and to laws made by the people themselves. Kings and dictators, to be successful, must build a reverence for their authority. Democracies must build a wholesome respect for their laws through an appeal to an emotion higher than that loyalty to a person. Loyalty to the common good, to a common purpose, is the highest form of loyalty. This is the loyalty implied in the Christian religion, which makes loyalty to God and not to a person, the highest form of loyalty. People with the soul of a worm can never aspire to self-government until their emotional nature has been transformed. How to get this respect and obedience to laws in a democracy, without presence of reverence, awe, and fear which kings and dictators inspire, is a big problem; but it is not an impossible problem if the right means of education be used.

It has always been assumed that enlightenment or knowledge was necessary to the preservation of a democracy. This is doubtless true, but enlightenment or knowledge is not enough. Only one example is needed to prove this point. Enough knowledge has been dinned into the consciousness of every individual to prevent the murdering yearly on our highways of 36,000 people and the injuring of a hundred thousand. Yet, there is no evidence that this knowledge has had any effect. On the other hand, let an individual have, in connection with traffic regulations, some dramatic experience, such as a miraculous escape from death or the loss of a relative or dear friend, and the chances are that he will thereafter have respect for the laws of the highway.

Respect for law, then, is an emotional culture. Knowledge alone does not give rise to emotions. This fact has been long known, and it is surprising that education has given so little recognition to it. Perhaps it is the "Three R" myth which has caused education to neglect the emotional life of the child. Be that as it may, we know that the right attitude toward law is a necessity in a democracy, and it is high time we found some effective means of developing that right attitude in the oncoming generation.

The Sense of Honor Is Clearly the Emotion Needed to Take the Place of Reverence and Awe Inspired by Persons. Public opinion often deters people from law-breaking, but it does not build in them a sense of honor. Public opinion, of course, should be used to prevent

lawbreaking. Fear of public opinion is a wholesome kind of fear which checks many people who otherwise would not hesitate to break the law. Fear of being caught has prevented many persons from committing crime.

But a *sense of honor* inspires one to keep the laws because he wants to keep them; a man of honor deems it fitting to keep faith with mankind, to stand by an agreement no matter what the cost, to be even more just than he is compelled to be. It is the predominance of this sense of honor that has made our democracy succeed in spite of all the prophecies to the contrary, that has brought it out of the experimental stage into full proof of its possibilities.

In places where democracy has failed, the lack of a sense of honor on the part of the people, particularly the officials, has been the most outstanding cause of failure. A sense of honor is the predominant quality of the great men and women of our history, whom we revere today. The thousands of officials who have served their fellowmen in office, motivated by a high sense of honor, give proof that the hope of democracy is not unfounded.

The greatest threat to democracy is from men *without* honor; men who in office disregard their pledges to seek the public good, and seek only their own profit; men who seek their own profit in business without a sense of justice and honor; men who defraud their neighbors and yet keep within the letter of the law.

How may a sense of honor be cultivated? Psychologists are earnestly seeking light on this question now. But a few things are already known: Knowledge *alone* will not develop a sense of honor; honor grows out of the experiences of life, and this fact implies that the necessary honor-creating experiences must be provided, even though this process does result in less attention to some of the dead subject matter taught in the schools of today.

Public Spirit Is an Emotional Cornerstone of Democracy. Public spirit is the spirit of brotherhood which causes a man to feel at one with his neighbors, to work for their good as his own, to virtually lay down his life for them in their distress. Citizens exemplifying this spirit claim no privileges for themselves which they would not grant to others. They are in striking contrast to those who claim the rights and privileges of citizenship without in any way *feeling* the *oneness* which makes them a part of the community.

Many observant people see a growing lack of public spirit in America today. For public spirit there is being substituted a group, or class, spirit. The employer groups, in far too many instances, look at social and economic questions from the standpoint of the interest of their own group rather than from that of the public welfare. On the other hand, labor groups are just as likely to ignore the effects of their acts upon the public welfare. Even social and political organizations may pursue their objectives without regard to the public welfare. This kind of spirit can end in but one thing—tragedy. The welfare of all must be placed above the welfare of a few.

True public-spirited citizens are social-minded, and so naturally need less government. With them the question of liberty and equality offers no difficult problems.

With a highly developed social consciousness, or public spirit, the amount of government could be reduced. The vast number of laws today is an eloquent sign of growing weakness.

A Common Ideal Is the Keystone of Democracy. The common *ideal* differs from the common *purpose.* The common purpose is the desire to obtain certain ends. When these ends are once attained they cease to be a unifying force. In the process of their attainment, however, a common ideal may develop, and this ideal may become the directing emotion for the further acts of the group. In American democracy, this common ideal is emerging as a democratic philosophy of life.

While we must admit that there is a lessening faith in the ideals of democracy, yet this regrettable state is offset by a very large and active group of citizens who are awake to threats to democracy, and fully conscious of all the misery that democracy's failure would involve. This virile group still believes in the American Dream, that our Republic will become in reality a country

> . . . . where there will be justice and fair play for all, where mutual sympathy and understanding will reign between all classes, and where the strong will not seek to dominate and exploit the weak, but will aid and strengthen them.

Opportunities and Responsibilities of Youth

ALBERT J. LEWIS*

Change, chaos, confusion, disintegration, conflict. These words most adequately picture contemporary life. It is a mumble-jumble, topsy-turvy, willy-nilly confusion of ideas and institutions. A paradoxical disorganization unified almost solely by its utter confusion. This is the world that youth faces. Why this chaos?

Civilization seems helplessly possessed by the titanic forces launched by modern science. I say possessed, because we are possessed. We have not mastered science; science has enslaved us. The ethic of individualism, contemporary society based on that ethic, has proved itself utterly incapable of controlling and creatively using the stupendous power born of science. See how the power in the hands of man has increased: since 1900 the total horsepower per capita has been multiplied nine times. In 1900 the individual had 3 horsepower at his disposal, today he has 27 horsepower. Yesterday he beat his way across continents in lumbering oxcarts, today he careens dizzily through space from continent to continent. Yesterday each home supplied itself with the necessaries of life, today huge factories under roofed miles of steel and glass supply the world.

Our present controls have failed to confine this terrific flood of energy. It has called for social control but we could not coöperate for we believed in every individual for himself. Our acquisitive and competitive ethics would not permit intelligent social planning for more abundant life for all. United we stand, divided we plunge to chaos. Rugged individualism has divided us, and the resulting confusion has caused one thinker to lament: "The civilization of the West is yet scarcely more than glorified savagery."

What are the characteristics of this glorified savagery?

*Mr. Lewis is a student in the School of Religion at Tufts College, Massachusetts. He writes as a spokesman of youth in our time.—*Editor.*

Contemporary life is characterized by three profoundly significant movements:

1. A retreat from order.
2. A retreat from freedom.
3. A retreat from reality.

Let us consider the *retreat from order.* Specialization, the key of modern science, has opened the doors to a new world. Life has suddenly, precipitately, grown amazingly huge and complex, and exceedingly difficult to understand and control. Yesterday our fathers blazed their paths across sizzling deserts and towering mountains to conquer a continent. They knew their enemies, the lurking Indian, the killing heat of the desert sun, the freezing cold of the snow-clogged mountain passes. These enemies were visible, knowable, therefore controllable. Not so with our world. Few men possess the synoptic view necessary for intelligent decisions and action. What does the average man know of the operations of the stock market, the functioning of the gold standard, or the condition of the world market? These vitally affect our lives, to be sure, but the world's complexity and sprawling hugeness place it almost beyond understanding.

But science has not only made our world more difficult to understand; it has by dint of its space-consuming inventions thrown us suddenly together. We do not know how to live together and have therefore quarrelled. Class has fought against class, race against race, labor against capital, nation against nation. Economic war, political war, social war, ideological war. War! War! War! War has ravaged our civilization, and sapped the bloodstream from the vitals of civilization. To be sure we have preached in our churches of brotherhood and democracy and given glib lip-service to the dignity of human personality, but at the same time built bigger and better machines of destruction with which to destroy man and his works. What a ghastly mix-up! Look at the world and try to make sense of it. Confusion, disintegration, conflict, chaos! In this hodgepodge we see the *retreat from order.*

Stemming from specialization and disorder is the *retreat from freedom.* Freedom is the ordering of life so that we may pursue our life values with sense enough to allow others to pursue theirs. Freedom grows out of order. Not understanding our world we have not ordered it, and failing to order it we have lost our freedom. In many fields we find a degenerate condition of competition; walls have been erected by groups to protect their special privileges. Trade unions have raised dues and limited membership, trade associations have cornered markets, teachers have passed tenure laws, the unemployed have formed associations plugging for bigger and better WPA. All of these restraints mean less freedom, for they are competitive rather than coöperative. They exclude rather than include. They are formed to prevent others from having the same privileges and opportunities as the members.

Also growing from this chaos and contributing to the movement away from freedom are the conflicts and violence of modern life. Differences have led to warfare, the use of force to attain ends, and violence and force are not respecters of freedom. Absolute censorship, absolute obedience, absolute dictatorship are the demands of war. While we have not suffered as much as others, we must not forget that as long as one man is in chains, humanity is in danger. Out of disorder then has grown a threat to freedom.

A second contributing factor to the *retreat from freedom* is the modern mass-production method which demands concentration of power. Gigantic industries have mushroomed up, and a few men have gained control of these key industries. This means tremendous and dangerous power in the hands of a few; 2 per cent of our population have controlled 80 per cent of our wealth. This concentration of power called for public regulation. Industries upon which millions of lives depend are too precious to trust to the whim and fancy of a few men who know no gods but profit and individual glory, and who resent the thought that they owe responsibility for their acts to society at large. Our ethic of individualism has prevented us from controlling these industries for the benefit of the people; consequently we have been exploited and the power of monopoly has been abused. Workers are told to shut up or move on; prices are raised to the highest possible level; economic power is wielded to public disadvantage. This economic power has meant political power, and oftentimes the so-called representatives of the people have been but puppets of privilege. This enormous exercise of power is corrupting, for as Lord Acton said: "Power corrupts, absolute power absolutely corrupts." It destroys freedom, it imperils democracy. The uncontrolled concentration of power and the chaos growing from disorder, then, have caused this significant *retreat from freedom.*

Man faces a world of confusion, chaos, dictatorship. He has tried desperately to control his world but his tools have been inadequate. The dams of individualism have collapsed under the floodtide of modern technology. Frustrated, disillusioned, almost without hope, man has hastened into a *retreat from reality.* Pessimism, cynicism, and other-worldliness have been the result.

Talk to the man in the street, to the unemployed, to the driver on your bus, and to the student just out of high school walking the street. Pessimistic, bitter, wondering where their next meal, their next pair of shoes, or the money for the light bill will come from. A bus driver said to me the other day: "Something gotta be done durn soon, son, or things will be a poppin." And then with a despairing look: "but what is there to do?" Many like him have finally given up hope and are sinking into a slough of pessimism that will be their grave. This failure to face the facts of life, this pessimism is a sorry *retreat from reality.*

Some men however have not grown cynical. Frustrated and thwarted, they have turned to the church which has welcomed them and bid them rest their burdens on the everlasting arms. This movement is obvious in the growth of the Catholic church with its emphasis on the sham of this life and the reality of the next life; in the growth of High Church Episcopalianism with a similar emphasis on ritual; and in the growing popularity of Barthian Theology on the continent of Europe. All of these movements emphasize the resting of our burdens on God. On God, forsooth! As if God would step down from heaven to solve our unemployment problems, and run our wars! It is nothing but an escape from the mature responsibility of social life!

This then is the *retreat from reality.* Man, repulsed by a problem he cannot solve with present equipment, (the ethic of individualism), retreats in disorderly confusion into a false pessimism or an other-worldly mysticism, thus escaping reality. George Santayana, the

great Harvard philosopher, seeing this cried: "Civilization is approaching another long winter and I wonder when the spring will come again."

Is this the lot of youth . . . to wonder when the spring will come again? I think not. Civilization is confused and chaotic but it is fluid. We could build it over the way it should be built if we are willing to make the sacrifices and pay the price.

Our opportunities and responsibilities lie in seeking out the constructive forces at work in life and using them to build a better world. And all is not negative. While society has been retreating in confusion there have been creative and healing forces at work out of sight, white corpuscles in the blood stream of civilization, gathering around the wounds and rebuilding the rotting tissue. We find today, as never before, a universal desire for peace, a growing appreciation of the magnitude of our task in building a democracy, a conviction of the interdependence of life. Under the bludgeon of experience we are learning that men cannot live unto themselves. We share a common fate. These convictions must be harnessed in building a better life for mankind.

The enormous energy of modern technology, fraught as it is with danger for man, is freighted with infinite possibilities for more abundant life. By changing man's outlook from one of personal welfare to social welfare, from rugged individualism to human brotherhood, we can gain the strength necessary to control the terribly potent flood of energy which now threatens to inundate civilization. Democracy can be extended into mass-production industries; a modicum of security and an abundance of freedom may be gained by planning and ordering our world for the benefit of all.

Before man can halt these disastrous retreats from freedom and from order he must squarely face his problems. A frank facing of reality is absolutely necessary to a fundamental attack on his problems. The church must not shelter men from the storms of life but give them courage and strength to face them creatively. Conflict is the stuff out of which character is built, and civilization is based on character. Let religion give man a justifiable optimism, a noble faith, an exalted vision, and high courage. This universe is based on law. If we obey nature, nature will obey us. If we obey life, life will obey us. Let the church then withdraw man only to give him perspective, lofty courage, a firm faith, and the tools with which to work; and then send him forth to build the kingdom on earth. A religion that does anything less is a failure.

Here then is our mighty challenge, our opportunity, and our responsibility. Mankind has long struggled up a rough, hard road to increasing freedom, order, and more abundant life. We have been given that heritage, we have been handed the torch of progress. We have been called as were the men of old, and here is our answer: We dare to live! We have no fear! Life is an adventure of high courage and noble work. We dare to dream of a better world and we will make that dream come true!

"Representatives of Two Nations Join in Building a Rural School"

CLARENCE SENIOR

That was the headline in big black type across the top of the peasant paper in Torreon, Coahuila, Mexico, last summer. It referred to a new venture in creating understanding between the peoples north and south of the Rio Grande.

Late in June, nineteen students from eleven American colleges and universities crossed the International Bridge at Laredo, on a pioneering trek into the heart of one of Mexico's hottest deserts. There they spent five weeks working side by side with members of the Santa Ana communal cotton farm, building a six-room school for peasant children. While the sun beat down mercilessly and the wind stung them with desert dust, they mixed adobe, fashioned bricks, hauled stone and sand, dug foundations, and built a monument to a new kind of inter-American cultural contact.

The Student Work Seminar in Mexico was organized as part of the program of the Student Peace Service of the American Friends Service Committee. Always on the alert to find ways of resolving conflict situations peacefully, the Service Committee six years ago organized the first student work camp in the United States. Each summer, six to ten groups of college students have spent their vacations, their energy, and their own money working at manual labor in localities where some vital American problem is being worked out: the Mississippi cotton delta, the crumbling coal towns of Pennsylvania, the Tennessee valley, the Georgia "cracker" country, the San Pedro docks. Days are spent in carrying out some community project; evenings in learning the real story of local problems and in building personal friendships.

"American democracy will not be preserved by preparing vast armies for continental defense. It will be maintained by learning to deal in constructive and nonviolent ways with our internal problems of economic insecurity and racial intolerance." That is the keynote of the work camp program.

Since contacts with Latin America were increasing and promised to increase far more, the Committee extended its program to our nearest southern neighbor. It was obvious that understanding between the peoples of the United States and Mexico could not be built on contacts of a diplomatic nature alone. Diplomacy follows its own devices—even in democracies diplomats have been known to be less than candid in reporting to the sovereign people. Until Ambassadors Morrow and Daniels, that had been particularly true of Washington's representatives in Mexico City. When the work seminar was explained to Ambassador Daniels, he gave it his hearty approval. He was joined by General Eduardo Hay, Mexican Minister of Foreign Relations, Lic. Gonzalo Vásquez Vela, Minister of Public Education, and other Mexican officials.

The Laguna communal farm region, an irrigated oasis, was chosen. There almost 150,000 peasants own collectively and cultivate coöperatively 308 *ejidos,* as Mexican collective farms are called. Cotton is their main crop. Only a short time free from the same sort of feudalism which characterizes our own cotton econ-

omy, the peasants are working to overcome the handicaps of their former position. After giving them much of the land of the large haciendas on Oct. 6, 1936, President Lázaro Cárdenas also placed government credit and technical advice at their disposal. Health services were created for peasants who had never seen a doctor in all their lives. The influence of the *curanderas,* witch doctors, was attacked. Intensive educational activity was begun. A large degree of self-government in the *ejidos* was worked out; essentially an adaptation to large-scale agriculture of the Aztec system of community land ownership and democratic government.

It was into the midst of this turbulent stream of social change that the work camp came.

At first, the peasant leaders who were asked for their opinion on the project were a bit diffident. The idea of American college boys working in the summer sun and dust of their farms was too strange to grasp easily. Naturally, they judged the American student by his Mexican counterpart. Their reactions were much the same as those of an American worker before the country club atmosphere faded from our universities. When it was suggested to them that an attempt was being made to get Mexican students to work with the Americans and the peasants, the idea was received with polite incredulity.

The *ejido* of Santa Ana was picked as the site of the work camp. Its 150 families live in adobe huts with straw roofs on the bank of what several months in the year is the Nazas River. The rest of the time it is merely a trough in the sand. Plans had been made for a school, and several thousand adobe bricks had already been piled in the sun to dry. Around the new school, the entire village was to be rebuilt. Profits from the first three years of socialized operation were being used.

Engineers from the communal land credit bank, officials of the educational system, the mayor, peasant leaders, and newspaper reporters and photographers greeted the four-car caravan when it arrived in Torreon, the chief city of the region. From the day of their arrival to the tremendous leave-taking banquet five weeks later, the students and their activities were news in the local and national press and on the radio. Santa Ana is one of the most common village names, but a letter addressed to one of the students simply at "Santa Ana, Mexico" reached him promptly.

The morning the ground was broken for the school's foundation, the entire village and many peasants from surrounding *ejidos* were on hand to welcome the group. The heavy, unaccustomed work, the oppressive heat and even the strange breakfast that they had been served that morning, did not seem to matter. Each boy working before the peasants seemed possessed with the feeling that he represented not only himself, but all of the ideals and ideas he held for international understanding. At noon they had to be warned against working too strenuously in a region where even the natives walk close to the buildings to keep out of the sunshine.

At lunch they were besieged with offerings of fruits, lemonade, and native dishes by the women of the *ejido.* A table was set up under a tree in the village where each noon some new regional dish was offered. Around the table both the boys and the villagers gathered after lunch and took turn singing songs. Most frequent requests were for "Old MacDonald Had a Farm" and "Alexander's Ragtime Band." Later, folk dances were performed. Next, softball games were organized. From the first, lessons in English and Spanish were exchanged as small groups gathered around the more articulate students and peasants.

On the fourth of July the first adobe brick was laid on the stone foundation. Ray Newton, secretary of the Peace Section of the American Friends Service Committee, who worked as one of the group, and the head of the *ejido* grasped the brick together and placed it as a crowd gathered from all around the region cheered. Homemade, hand-painted Mexican and American paper flags waved on the improvised speakers' platform. Speeches of both Mexicans and Americans displayed an emotional depth and fervor which moved the crowd to frequent applause. The Mexicans vowed that the work of the students would be engraved forever in their hearts.

After working hours spent in digging, hauling sand, mixing mortar, carrying twenty-pound bricks—and even, shoes and stockings off, tramping straw into mud for the adobe in the Biblical tradition—the boys studied books on Mexico, heard speakers, held discussions, and attended meetings of *ejidos.* Occasionally ball games were arranged between the group and the team of some *ejido.* Some of the boys reported ruefully that while baseball might be an American game, perhaps they were not the outstanding exponents of it!

Knowing that in a social experiment of that magnitude there were some whose toes had been stepped on, the group arranged to hear the point of view of the former property owners. Although the *haciendados* had each been given their choice of at least 370 acres to be kept when their land was expropriated, there were many who were bitter toward the new regime. There were others, however, who said, "I did not till my land, and it is only elementary justice that those who worked it now own it."

The students tried to see the Laguna region in relation to the rest of Mexico's land program, tremendously speeded up since 1934 under President Cárdenas. They knew that angry notes protesting against the expropriation of land held by United States interests had been sent from Washington to Mexico. They learned that these notes, and the threats they contained, had caused Mexico to give American creditors a favored position over their own citizens and those of other foreign countries. They heard, from South American agronomists studying the Laguna organization, that the land problem is the key to social advance in every one of the republics south of us, and that progressive forces there look to Mexico for inspiration and guidance.

From a negro vice-president of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union, present with a sharecropper delegation from our own cotton territory, they learned that we have at least one serious problem Mexico does not need to solve—discrimination against persons of different color. Although accepted by the students, with whom he worked on the school for several days, and by the Mexicans, he ruefully reported some of his experiences in trying to find eating and sleeping accommodations on his journey to Mexico from Memphis. "It is fine down here," he said, "but my troubles will start again as soon as I cross the border back into the United States." That Latin America will never completely trust our pretentions to democracy and fair dealing until this blot on our civilization is removed

was quite obvious from the Mexican reaction to his experience.

A week in Mexico City, interviewing Ambassador Daniels, labor people, government officials, economists, artists, social workers, students, and religious leaders, rounded out the Mexican service seminar.

Before leaving, the Seminar invited Mexican students to send a similar group to the United States next summer to work on some community project and get to know their northern neighbors.

Now the students are back at their desks. They have taken some of Mexico, part of her traditions, part of her sorrows, part of her hopes for reconstruction back with them. On eleven campuses, at meetings of student and town groups, there are active agents of enlightenment on Mexican affairs.

From Yale, an undergraduate who participated in the group wrote: "For all of us, Mexico is now something more than a green spot on the map; it is a land of friendly, intelligent, and gracious people, some of whom are our friends. To some of the Mexicans at least, there are some Americans who are interested in more than making a huge fortune by exploiting their people."

This year, two groups will go to Mexico from American campuses. A group of Mexicans will cross the Rio Grande to work in some American community. Year by year, from sweat mingled with the soil of both countries, will come the forces that will erase the hate-charged words: "gringo" and "greaser." In their place, twin words will resound on both sides of the border: *amigo,* friend.

A Layman's Opinion

CATHERINE APPLEBY

Why is there so much controversy in our press and ecclesiastical circles on the subject of birth control? Most of the arguments presented for both sides are entirely unnecessary. This problem should be between the individual patient and her doctor, and, since this is where it comes in the end, why not leave it there?

Reader's Digest has given us both sides of the question, and the religious arguments against the use of birth control are most confusing. They are understandable only to the class of people who will not be greatly benefitted by the use of contraceptive means in any case, for those who are well-educated enough to understand the fine line of difference in the literal and figurative translation of the words and phrases used to define the attitude of the churches on this subject are usually well-to-do enough to properly care for the results of their "self-indulgence."

On the other hand, those for whom the birth control clinics are primarily intended are benefitted beyond comparison by intelligent control of the forces of nature, through the competently-advised use of contraceptive means. There are so many pitiful cases, women worn beyond their years, health broken, enjoyment in their children absolutely unknown. In most cases, crass ignorance is the cause.

Mrs. W—, mother of thirteen children, ranging in age from three to twenty years, harassed, bedridden a good part of her time, suddenly became insane. For some years she had needed an operation for female trouble, which she was financially unable to have, and which was constantly aggravated by an almost continual state of pregnancy. Her children and her home were denied her ministrations at a time when they were most needed by both. Competent instruction in birth control methods and medical treatment for her trouble would have saved this woman's mind, and her body from such a gruelling experience.

Mrs. C—, about thirty-five years old, is the mother of seven children. She looks fifty years of age, misshapen and hopeless. Her husband drinks, works only part time. She is vastly resentful of a society that gives her nothing but a continual round of drudgery and childbearing. The children are dirty and untended. Had this family been restricted to three, or even four, children, she would have had more time for them and for herself, and would get more pleasure out of life in general. Why should these women be forced into such positions? Why should they not know how to help themselves?

In the strata of society to which birth control would be directed, there are individuals who would be too lazy, too uncaring to learn, there are those who would put their knowledge to the "wrong" use, to escape the consequences of "sin," but what about the thousands upon thousands of homes and families that could be saved by intelligent use of contraceptive measures to guard the health of the mother, the force that creates homes and, having created them, holds them together?

The number of women, young women, who are rendered sterile each year from their ignorant efforts to escape a burden that seems intolerable, are beyond computation. These girls, for such they are, most of them being not yet twenty-five years old, know there is such a thing as birth control, but being denied competent instruction are determined to find out for themselves, following the time-honored method of trial and error, which in the majority of cases leaves the experimenter injured for life, if life be spared her.

One case of which I know, is that of a young married woman, Mrs. F—, twenty-five years old, who has one son, six years of age. Several years ago, she became pregnant. Her husband was out of work, their condition was desperate. I do not know how it was done, but by some means she induced abortion. Her doctor warned her, but a year later it happened again. This time the results were more serious, she was hospitalized, transfusions were given; after weeks of convalescence she was able again to take her place in her home. Why should this woman have this burden on her soul and mind? It is infinitely worse for these things to happen after conception, and humanity being what it is they will happen, than to prevent them from happening at all. Why is it illegal for her doctor to give her information necessary to avoid this excessive physical strain?

There is the case of Mary D—. The family was very poor, they lived in a neighborhood where rickets in children were the accepted thing, pellagra was there, too; and Mary did not want to bring her children into such a world. She wanted to wait, at least until they were sure of their ability to feed their offspring. And

so Mary had recourse to an old wives' remedy, with no apparent luck. She did not induce the abortion she was striving for. Her term ran out; in the course of time her baby was born, an apparently healthy boy. But, when the boy was four years old, he could barely crawl, his limbs were deformed, he had no mind; and just about this time, another boy was born. This child looked better, he was fat, he laughed and cooed as a normal baby. He walked, he had a strong, straight body, but he, too, was an idiot. Both of these children are in a state institution; as they grow older, they become more dangerous to have at large,—the laughter, the jibes of other children, rouse them to black anger, even though they cannot understand the reason for it.

On the other hand, there are those who are too lazy to practise birth control when it can be legally used. One woman I know, only thirty-two years old, married sixteen years, has been pregnant fourteen times, with ten of the children living. How this woman ever carries a child nine months is one of the mysteries of nature. Her last child, born Wednesday, had to be given a blood transfusion on Thursday, to keep it alive. Her body is too depleted in vitality to give a child physical or mental strength. For women such as this, I would make it a criminal offense not to practise birth control!

These cases are all those of married women. It seems worse to me, and to them when they discuss it, that unmarried couples can, and do, obtain birth control information with no apparent difficulty, though no one seems to know how they do it, or from whence the information comes. Businesswomen, who can afford to pay handsomely for the information, have no trouble getting expert advice. Only the frightened, ignorant mother of a poor family, who really needs and would benefit from the information in a perfectly legitimate way, cannot learn how to control her family, or to protect her own health.

The American people have proved that they can take things, or leave them alone. Give them birth control, legally and openly, to use when for economic or physical reasons they think it necessary; give them the choice, and we will not suffer from it. Always, there are those who will use it for bad purposes, those who will not use it at all, but the majority of our citizens will be greatly benefitted by the measure, and our future generations will be a better race of men.

Belgium's Dire Dilemma

Brussels—What was the true nature of the crisis that shook Western Europe in mid-January and whose repercussions troubled the policies of several countries afterwards for weeks? Did the Nazis really intend to invade the Low Countries? Was the January situation genuinely as menacing as that of mid-November? Or was there truth in the German allegation that the whole affair was concocted by the Allies to "turn the neutrals against Germany"?

Certain unknown facts can be revealed by the *No-frontier News Service,* through its European bureau in Brussels, that show the crisis to have been internal rather than international, though everything is not completely clear, and the attitude of the Nazis certainly played at least a minor part.

Fact number one: The "sudden" crisis call of troops in Phase D of the mobilization plan, and the cancelling of leaves granted only a few days before, was far from "sudden" in entirety. It was definitely known in a limited informed circle two weeks and a half in advance, that Phase D was scheduled for early January. If that were true, how could the crisis have been due to a new Nazi threat?

Fact number two: Certain extreme groups of Flemish nationalists—who must carefully be distinguished from the vast Flemish nationalist majority—were discovered to have received money from Nazi sources in Essen, which probably means Goering's paper, the *Essener Zeitung.* That brought back memories of the World War, when the Germans tried the same tactics, not without some initial success.

Fact number three: The Communists, virtually constituting themselves allies of Hitlerism and using phrases about "peace" as hypocritically in Belgium as in most countries, were boldly sending pamphlets of an anti-government, anti-Allied, but also pro-Fascist type throughout the Army in huge quantities, and even across the frontier among French soldiers as well. Whatever you may think about free speech, no government which is zealously refraining from verbal attacks on the very Nazis it fears on the East, is going to permit its troops at the frontier to be indoctrinated with pro-Nazi ideas, or to be "propagandized" with anti-Allied material that violates in one direction the official neutrality of the country so painfully being maintained in the other direction.

Fact number four: As in all countries under arms, there is a tendency for the military to want to keep matters in their hands, to crave a measure of political control, and to be free from the restraint of civilian authority. Added to this is the subsidiary fact that two rival plans of defense have aroused discussion for some time, that of M. Devèze, a former War Minister, favoring a line close to the German frontier, and that of General Nuyten, one relying upon the heavy fortifications and natural defenses along the Meuse and the Scheldt. The King was in accord with General Nuyten's plan, and M. Devèze is out of authority, Nuyten having been given a military post next to the King himself, who, under Phase D, becomes supreme head of the armed forces. Phase D also confers certain powers of censorship over the press upon the army chieftains, and one of the first steps taken after the crisis was the suppression of all Communist papers, the Flemish Nationalist paper *Volk en Staat,* (the one charged with using German funds), and the announcement of further measures to come.

It happened that all these factors, any one of which might have precipitated a crisis, occurred at the same time. And along with them, there actually were heavy troop movements on the German side of the Dutch-Belgian frontier, movements which are now believed to have been the exchange of troops going on leave for front-line replacements. It also happened that German planes had been flying disregardfully over Belgian soil, and that one came down with papers that were of at least a somewhat alarming character. And it happened that various commanders had been permitting some of their men to go home on leave, and a hurried check-up revealed that over one-sixth of the shock troops were

away from the line, a weakness too great in the eyes of the authorities in the jittery prevailing situation.

Naturally the public, which has kept remarkably sane and poised through all these anxieties, is eager to know what will happen next. It does not want censorship, but it asks whether the most democratic form of government can survive if it allows free circulation of ideas that are near-Fascist if not openly so, financed in some measure by Fascism from outside, in a time when it is being browbeaten by Nazi oratory and faced with a possible invasion. It is true that the Belgian-German-Allied trade talks have been going on throughout the critical period, but that does not constitute much of a safeguard. Since the war began there have been two very minor arrests of left radicals, one a Trotskyist, for distribution of literature of a defeatist character, but these took place weeks ago and both men were released in a few days. Three conscientious objectors are in prison, but their treatment has been much better than that meted out in the United States during the World War, and the ones who have been tried have received sentences infinitely lighter than American "CO's" got in 1917.

The danger is that one concentration of authority will lead to another, and that the country may end up, without being in war at all, under a rule as dictatorial as that of a minority-governed autocracy. That is a *danger;* to say that anything like that has as yet been approximated would be a gross exaggeration. Belgians do not give up their liberties easily, either to outsiders or to insiders. The tragedy is that the Flemish-Walloon issue, always smoldering under the surface, may be given new sharpness just when concessions by Walloons, even if inadequate, were beginning to effect real gains, and when Flemish Nationalists in the mass had turned away from leaders with Fascist tendencies to those of democratic, anti-militarist convictions.

The important Flemish newspapers, definitely nationalist in tone, *V. O. S.* and *Strijd,* have not been suppressed, though the former has agreed to make one concession, not in its subject matter but in its sub-title, and no longer calls itself an "anti-militarist Flemish weekly." If it be regretted that in such matters Belgium is now lagging behind the forthright freedom of speech allowed in belligerent England, it must be remembered in partial extenuation that Belgium and Holland have both been seething with plotters of many kinds, with not a few nefarious and damaging objectives. In Holland, for example, some firms have gone out of their way to counsel their employees not to resist the Nazis even by non-coöperation in the event of an invasion, but to work along with them with no friction. Other firms are already coöperating by receiving orders from Allied countries such as South Africa, which were formerly given to Germany, ordering the goods in a rush from Nazi factories, stamping them "Made in Holland" when the Nazis get them made up and shipped into the Netherlands, and cynically sending them on their way as if in all this there were nothing out of the usual. In Belgium, numerous White Russians, linked to the Czarists that so long flourished in Paris, have been trying to "horn in" on the Finnish defense by sending 500 Whites with propaganda loud-speakers to Finland, obviously in the hope that by fishing in these troubled waters something may yet rise to their ever-ready bait.

It all goes to show, if anyone needed to be shown, that the war of nerves is nevertheless a deadly war, and deadly to the welfare of those not even in it, but merely unlucky neighbors.

Nofrontier News Service.

The Study Table

Making History with Sonnets

SONNETS: AN ANTHOLOGY OF CONTEMPORARY POETRY. *Edited by Ralph Cheyney. New York City: Henry Harrison.*

Sonnets: An Anthology of Contemporary Poetry affords a generous cross section of modern American poetry and proves emphatically that even in this distinctively generic form of verse, poetry is being written with much vigor.

Sonnets is edited by that authority on the sonnet, Ralph Cheyney, and illustrated by Frank Utpatel with strength and keen poetic conception. The yardstick which Mr. Cheyney established as his motif of choice for selection of these 750 poems out of more than ten times that many submissions, he tells us, is unique in the annals of even *modern* literature. In his introductory argument, this editor cites a pledge made by the last Western Poets' Congress, of which he was president, to make their work "clearer, more socially significant, humanly helpful." This high resolve to connect poetry with *life*—contemporary living—suggested to Mr. Cheyney his countersign, "Documentary." This modern poet felt that all modern poets should be as aware of contemporary subject matter and turn it to their purposes of creative design as the poets and painters of that other Renaissance—and as effectively.

These poems of some 675 poets represented are grouped in five sections, with an additional prefatory essay for each sonnet form of the four classifications. These pertinent, brisk, little essays constitute one of the most valuable educational devices of the twentieth century poetry movement, defining as they do both the form and intention of the various types of sonnets in the light of their social, economic, and psychological background.

The first group of poems falls under the subtitle, "About Sonnets," and is by masters of form: William Ellery Leonard, Lucia Trent, and others. There follows classification under heads of Petrarchan and Shakespearean. For most readers, it is the intermediate group of poems, called by the editor, who is the first to isolate the form, "Westernized Petrarchan," which will hold the greater interest as typically American in content and feeling. It is in the last section, however, frankly labelled "Experimental" that the genuinely modern mind, which flees before the wind of the present like a hound on the scent of the future, will delight. The inclusion of these poems exhibits the fine generosity and prophetic vision of Ralph Cheyney.

Sonnets is an epochal volume in the history of compilation of American poems; contemporary not only in the letter but in the spirit of the term interpreted by modern *mind,* whose essential quality in any age is its awareness of the needs of the future stated in terms of plasticity—not leaning supinely on the past and its established forms. Real creativeness can only function in the freedom of such experimentation.

Perhaps this is the very genuine contribution Mr. Cheyney has made to contemporary poetry in his scholarly editing of this unique sonnet anthology! He has brought into nice comparative relationship the best of the current output molded on the classic forms, and selected with equal care and analysis the realistic (to many exotic) poetry of that adventuring "young poet" of his dedication, "as yet unknown who will outstrip us all in this field in which to compete is to coöperate."

SINCLAIR CRAVEN.

A Notable Project

TOLSTOI. *By Stefan Zweig. New York: Longmans, Green and Company. 154 pp. $1.00.*

This is one of the volumes in the "Living Thoughts Library" edited by Alfred O. Mendel, and published by Longmans, Green and Company. This project is one of the most interesting and ambitious undertakings in the field of philosophy that has appeared in a long time. It is an attempt to interpret in simple form and diction the heart of a thinker's philosophy with an introduction by an eminent man of letters. Tolstoi is introduced by Stefan Zweig, a sympathetic and competent guide. Selections from Tolstoi's writings complete the volume.

According to Zweig, Tolstoi's ideas made history on a world scale, his theoretical writings with their contradictions belong once and for all with the most important intellectual and social constituents of our times. Tolstoi, in line with the Old Testament prophets, attacked all forms of human selfishness as the root of every evil. Influenced by Plato, Jesus, Rousseau, and others he stands as the greatest of the Russian thinkers, and helped mould Russia for all time. An anti-institutionalist, Tolstoi helped purify the very groups he attacked. Everybody is familiar with his earnest desire to find the truth, and his willingness to suffer in the search.

The list of philosophers to be included in the "Library" is imposing. The present reviewer has also examined the volume on Montaigne by André Gide and found it the best introduction to the great essayist that he has ever seen. Much credit is due Mr. Mendel and the publishers. It is to be hoped that the series will be extended to include the creative minds in both ancient and modern philosophy. We need books like these.

CHARLES A. HAWLEY.

A Peace Program

HOW TO KEEP AMERICA OUT OF WAR. *By Kirby Page. 96 pp. Published coöperatively by seven peace organizations. 15c each; or 5c in fifty or hundred lots, ordered from the author, Box 247, LaHabra, California.*

Answering the query, "Why Keep America Out of War?" Kirby Page devotes seventy-four pages. First, we must get folks to understand the causes of this war. If anything can do it for even the dullest mind, this is it. Then we must make folks understand the consequences of this war. Third, we must develop a sound foreign policy for the United States of America. Fourth, we must preserve and strengthen civil liberties here in America. Fifth, we must follow a five-point program as follows: (1) Use available means of influencing public opinion; (2) help discipline emotions of the American people; (3) endeavor to influence governmental action; (4) persuade the churches to renounce war; and (5) proclaim personal determination not to approve of war or engage in its suicidal slaughter. Then come a dozen pages of affirmation, WE CAN KEEP AMERICA OUT OF WAR.

Hitler is the aggressor, but Britain, France, and the United States are the oppressors who drove the German people into Hitler's arms. There is nothing new in the main thesis for the informed, but many details are included which may be new to some. If we could get every voter in America to read this, the victory for a juster peace would be assured.

GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 34)

dor, and eventually the firing of Warsaw, and the bombardment of Modlin.

One of the articles of praise in the German press asserts: "Only a painter will be able to realize completely what it means to paint a burning city while one is lying on one's stomach in an airplane moving at the speed of 215 miles per hour. After having seen Professor Vollbehr's pictures we have to admit that it is impossible to get a better idea of the atmosphere of a big city which is being bombed and shelled."

Of this no one need question the truth, but if there is any meaning at all in what the Nazis used to call "degenerated art," should not that name be given to the work of Herr Hitler's official battle-painter?

Nofrontier News Service.

Dictators as Gods

Raw Materials or a Totalitarian Litany

By divine goodness came the dictators in countries where God is recognized by diplomatic courtesy, and in others by a cosmic goodness worthy of lyric exultation. But the theme is the same, whether sung in the columns of the controlled press of Spain, Germany, Russia, or other totalitarian lands. Here are a few examples:

"Madrid, keep alive for us in the depths of thy Castilian heart one efficient and eternal spark of that fire which he, Jose Antonio Primo de Rivera, came to bring into this world by divine command."—*El Norte de Castilla*, Burgos, November 25, 1939.

"O Great Stalin, O Leader of the Nations,
Thou who makest man to be born,
Thou who makest the earth fertile,
Thou who makest the centuries young,
Thou who makest the spring bloom,
Thou who makest the chords ring out music,
Thou who art the splendor of my spring,
O Thou, sun reflected by millions of hearts. . . ."

—*Pravda*, August 28, 1936.

"Like Moses, like Saint Francis Xavier, Jose Antonio Primo de Rivera left us at the moment, when he saw his promise accomplished."—*Diario Vasco*, San Sebastian, November 29, 1939.

"My Führer, I am today approaching your picture. That picture is large, overlarge and without limits; it is enormous, strong, beautiful and sublime; it is simple, kind, sincere, and warm; it is father, mother, and brother all together; and it is still far more. It carries the greatest years of my life; it contains the silent hours of meditation, the days full of distress and anxiety, the sun of most faithful fulfillment, the victory which has always been the beginning of new duties and new fields. The more I try to understand it, the greater, brighter, more endless it becomes to me; but I know that it was never strange or distant to me.

"You are the Führer, without needing to command; you are Life and you are Law. You are Love and you are Power; my heart is full with thinking of you.

"You are Liberty, because you have given a meaning to Duty, a meaning which supplies all work with joy, strength, and value. You have taken away the curse of toiling and laboring.

"So you are standing today in a cathedral of million-fold love, and the dome of this cathedral rises up to an endless height of light. . . ."—*Das Schwarze Korps*, Berlin, April 20, 1939.

Nofrontier News Service.